DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 030 CS 505 473

AUTHOR Keyton, Joann
TITLE Extrapolating a Dyadic Model to Small Group Methodology: Validation of the Spitzberg and Cupach Model of Communication Competence.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, November 13-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Research; Group Behavior; *Group Discussion; *Group Dynamics; Group Structure; Interaction; Interaction Process Analysis; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Competence; Social Behavior; Social Desirability; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS Communication Competencies; Communication Satisfaction

ABSTRACT

A study assessed the validity of applying the Spitzberg and Cupach dyadic model of communication competence to small group interaction. Twenty-four students, in five task-oriented work groups, completed questionnaires concerning self-competence, alter competence, interaction effectiveness, and other group members' interaction appropriateness. They also rated their group's interaction using the system for the multiple level observation of groups (SYMLOG). Results did not support the hypothesis that persons perceived as interacting appropriately by others in the group discussions would judge themselves as effective communicators. Appropriate behavior as judged by others was expected to be correlated to the self-assessed level of interaction involvement, but results were not significant. However, results did indicate that the target individual's level of satisfaction with the group's interaction positively correlated with the individual's self-assessment of competence in the interaction and that highly involved persons perceived themselves as being effective in the group interaction. Though the results did not support the first hypothesis, this provided validation for the competence model which postulates that individuals assess their own competence on a specific and molecular basis while they assess the competence of others on a generalized or molar basis. (Questionnaires used in the study are appended.) (SRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279030

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Student Debut

EXTRAPOLATING A DYADIC MODEL TO SMALL GROUP METHODOLOGY: VALIDATION OF THE SPITZBERG AND CUPACH MODEL OF COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joann Keyton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Joann Keyton
The Ohio State University
Department of Communication
205 Derby Hall
154 N. Oval Mall
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Abstract: The Spitzberg and Cupach model of communication competence is based on interactional and relational assumptions. Although presented as a dyadic model, its theoretical structure should also be applicable to small group settings. This study uses the model's measuring instruments both as a validation of the model and as a test of its applicability in a task-oriented small group setting.

This paper was presented in the Interpersonal and Small Group Interaction Division at the 1986 Speech Communication Association convention, Chicago, Illinois.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 505 473

The concept of communication competence is widely diversified with roots in both the trait and state perspectives of behavior. A more historical approach to communication competence perpetuates the notion that the ability of an individual to communicate competently is a trait of the personality. Or, that people possess the trait to some degree and that it is measurable without much variation regardless of situation. On the other hand, the state perspective proposes that the ability to communicate competently is a behavior that is influenced by the situational elements of the communication and that this ability will fluctuate over time and according to the situation.

Recent developments in the study of communication competence have led researchers to analyze the effect of the relationship on the ability of individuals to communicate competently. With this as the point of entry for their study of communication competence, Spitzberg and Cupach (1984) have developed a model of communication competence that focuses on the link between the appropriateness and effectiveness of dyadic interaction. Thus, the relational aspect of communication interaction is the basis for the analysis of message appropriateness and effectiveness.

Their model is based upon seven interrelated criteria. They are: 1) competence is perceived appropriateness and effectiveness; 2) competence is contextual; 3) competence is a matter of degree; 4) competence is both molar and molecular; 5) competent communication is functional; 6) competence is an interdependent process; and 7) competence is an interpersonal impression. The Spitzberg and Cupach communication competence

model is both an analysis of the cognitive and behavioral processes that occur within a dyadic relationship. The model critically examines four components for each individual: motivation, knowledge, skills, and criterion outcomes (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984).

> The model of relational competence is relational in the sense that it is sensitive to the implicit perceptions of the relationship held by the interactants. The operational procedures used to measure relational competence are episode-specific . . . the appropriateness and effectiveness of behaviors and the process in which these behaviors are enacted are contextualized by the relational definitions the interactants possess at the time (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984, p. 151).

Development of the Competence Instruments

Upon these criteria and definitions, questionnaires were developed to measure the appropriateness and effectiveness of a dyadic interaction in a given situation. The methodological format of using third party independent observers was eliminated since "interpersonal partners develop idiosyncratic rules for behavior . . . and merely viewing behaviors during a single interaction is not likely to reveal much about an interpersonal relationship that has been established over a period of time" (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981, p. 7).

More specifically, to assure the relational basis of the analysis, "there must be an assessment of the behavior of both individuals in a conversation" (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981, p. 3). After a period of research, three questionnaires were developed to measure communication competence, communication

appropriateness, and communication effectiveness following Spitzberg and Cupach's model of communication competence. First developed and tested were the questionnaires to measure competence to include an assessment of self and other competence.

Their findings resulted in the acknowledgment of differences between self and other competence. Other competence was consistently the best predictor of communication satisfaction. "In fact, other competence predicts satisfaction so well that when self and other competence are combined, self competence becomes an entirely insignificant predictor" (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981, p. 15). This strengthens the theory that communication competence is a dyadic construct and that relationships need to be relationally investigated (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981).

Further strengthening this argument is the fact that the self and other scales, although similar in the nature of their items, revealed divergent factor structures. It appears that perception of other competence is a global response while self competence exhibits a distinct factor structure of other orientation, conversation skills, and self-centered behavior. This indicates that individuals perceive their own behavior in greater detail, while perceiving the other person at a more general level. Thus, two separate instruments were constructed: one for self-competence ratings and one for alter competence ratings.

Spitzberg and Canary (in press) developed the measures for appropriateness and effectiveness. "The appropriateness measure refers to perceptions of others' behaviors that violate self's expectations, or sense of propriety. Effectiveness references self's sense of reward attainment and dominance in the

conversation" (Spitzberg & Canary, in press). To validate that appropriateness and effectiveness are critical components of communication competence, these two measures were used in the Cupach and Spitzberg (1981) study. Appropriateness correlated strongly (r= .69) with alter competence and moderately (r = .51) with self rated competence. Conversely, effectiveness correlated higher with self-rated competence (r = .62) than with alter competence (r = .54). The internal reliability for these measures were .91 and .85, respectively.

From this point, each of these four instruments--self-competence, alter competence, appropriateness, and effectiveness--were used in further studies. Canary and Spitzberg found that effectiveness and appropriateness were "related but conceptually distinct characteristics of communication" (Canary & Spitzberg, 1985, p. 3). They defined effective communication as that which accomplishes the goals, objectives, or intended functions of the interactant. Appropriate communication was operationalized as that which avoids the violation of the social, situational, or relational rules governing the communicative context (Canary & Spitzberg, 1985). In this later study, the appropriateness and effectiveness items were combined on one measuring instrument. Factor analysis suggested that these combined items tap three distinct types of conversational impressions: 1) items referencing the outcome effectiveness of the communication; 2) items referring to specifically appropriate remarks and behaviors within the conversation; and 3) items reflecting molar impressions of appropriateness (Canary & Spitzberg, 1985). Since then, the items have again been placed on two separate instruments:

one as a measure of effectiveness and one as a measure of appropriateness.

Although the Spitzberg and Cupach model is based on dyadic research it would seem to be appropriate to extend the model to small group interaction. For each of the hypotheses presented in this paper, the basis of the interaction is a small task-oriented group consisting of four to five members. Therefore, the following hypotheses are offered in an effort to: 1) validate the measurement instruments from the communication competence theories and models developed by Spitzberg and Cupach, 2) and extend their principles to small group research. First, to examine the model's critical relationship between the appropriateness and effectiveness measures:

> H1: Persons perceived as interacting appropriately by others in the group discussions will judge themselves as effective communicators.

Relationship of Satisfaction to Competence

A recurring aspect of the communication competence studies has been the linking of communication satisfaction to both appropriateness and effectiveness. Generally, "relationally competent communication is satisfying because it fulfills certain needs, goals, or functions for the actors involved" (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981). The appropriateness and effectiveness of the communication interaction is the vehicle for assuring satisfaction. In one of the developmental studies, subjects were administered Hecht's (1978) communication satisfaction (comsat) inventory. Self-competence was significantly correlated with

comsat (r = .41). The conclusion to this study affirmed the notion that "individuals who perceive themselves as engaging in competent interaction are generally satisfied with the recalled encounter" (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981, p. 14). However, the relationship between other competence and communication satisfaction was even stronger (r = .71).

In the Canary and Spitzberg (1985) study, subjects responded to each of the competence measures and made assessments of relational satisfaction. General and specific appropriateness were related to the indicators of satisfaction by coefficients of .49 and .51, respectively. There was a moderate association between effectiveness and satisfaction (r = .46).

The relationship between satisfaction and communication competence is an outgrowth of the relational perspective.

> Communicators possess a distinct perceptual position as well as personal and relational data to rely upon in assessing the conversational competence of self and other . . . the conversational partner is in the best position to know whether such goals were obtained via appropriate interaction (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1985, p. 94).

Further explanation of this relationship can be found in one of the seven assumptions regarding relational communication competence.

> Communication affects individual goals, relational status or goals, and one's sense of self. These objectives, in turn, suggest functional outcomes. Instrumentally effective communication, because it results in the fulfillment of positive expectations, should be self-satisfying. Interpersonally successful communication, because it brings about relational rewards or congruence of relationship definition, should result in relationship satisfaction and perceptual congruence (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1985, p. 113).

Wall and Nolan's (in press) satisfaction measure assesses both process and outcome satisfaction. The 12-item instrument was designed to measure an individual's satisfaction with his/her group's interaction and an individiual's satisfaction with his/her role in the group's interaction. Representative items from the instrument are: "I felt my ideas were stifled by my group," and "Overall, I am satisfied with my group's performance for the project."

Therefore, in an effort to further explore the association between satisfaction with the communication interaction and competence perceptions, the following hypothesis is presented:

> H2: An individual's level of satisfaction with the group interaction will positively correlate with the self-assessment of one's own competence in the interaction.

Communication Competence and Interaction Involvement

The Interaction Involvement model (Cegala, 1984) considers the presence of trait behaviors in the communication situation. Involvement is described as a state of existence. One is always involved, yet involvement may be internally or externally focused. In dyadic communication, external involvement could be characterized as attending to the matter at hand and paying attention to the other actor. High involved individuals are sensitive to self as a social object, causing them to consider the meaning of circumstances as they arise in conversation and respond accordingly. Low involved individuals are removed psychologically and communicatively from the ongoing interaction (Cegala, 1984).

The Interaction Involvement Scale (IIS) is composed of three factors: 1) responsiveness, 2) perceptiveness, and 3) attentiveness. Responsiveness is an index of the actor's certainty in responding to the social situation. Perceptiveness is the actor's sensitivity about meanings applied to his/her own and others' behavior. Attentiveness is the extent to which the actor responds to cues in the situation (Cegala, 1984).

The program of research on interaction involvement assumes that competence is best viewed as consisting of cognitive, affective, and performance components. People who differ in possession of trait level interaction involvement are expected to differ in their cognitive and affective experiences during interaction (Cegala, 1984).

The relationship of the affective component of interaction involvement to competence results from the premise that human emotions play an important part in the experience of intersubjectivity (Cegala, 1984). The cognitive processes of perception and memory directly affect the level of information processing and recall.

Together the three factors that compose Interaction Involvement mirror the appropriateness description provided by the Spitzberg and Cupach models. Accordingly it is hypothesized that:

> H3: A highly involved person will be perceived as interacting appropriately by the other group members.

And, thus, if a person is involved in the interaction that

involvement should give the person a sense of being an effective communicator:

> H4: A highly involved person will perceive him/herself as being effective in the group interaction.

Communication Competence and SYMLOG Ratings

SYMLOG--System for the Multiple Level Observation of Groups--(Bales & Cohen, 1979) is a rating and scoring methodology for analyzing group interaction. The rating system is easy to understand and requires little or no training for group members to effectively use the method. The foundation for SYMLOG rests on three dimensions: 1) dominance-submissiveness represented by the letters U-D; 2) positive-negative represented by the letters P-N; and 3) task orientation-emotional expressiveness represented by the letters F-B (Bales & Cohen, 1979). Each group member rates themselves and each other group member on 26 adjective groupings. The evaluation of those ratings results in a score for each of the three dimensions. As a result, a person can be perceived as behaving in any one of the 26 combinations afforded by the three dimensions.

Descriptions of the pure dimensions are:

> U: takes the initiative in speaking; speaks loudly, firmly, rapidly, or with few pauses for the other to reply. Addresses communications to the group as a whole rather than to individuals.
>
> D: participates only when asked questions, then speaks only to the person who asked the questions; gives only minimal information in response to a question.

P: assumes equality between self and others, asks others for their opinions, balances talking with listening, or starts talking and stops talking flexibly and easily in response to the needs of others.

N: shows predictable disagreement with others in communication; seems unfriendly in response to the friendly approach of others; seems detached, isolated, indifferent, distant, unsocial, secluded, unapproachable, or not a member of the group.

F: works on the task of the group by serious efforts at problem solving; makes sincere statement of beliefs, values, or assumptions, but in a judicious and controlled way; verbally explores hypotheses by conjecturing, interpreting, or inferring; or tries to understand, assess, or diagnose the problem by communicating opinions and attitudes.

B: changes mood of interaction suddenly, indicates that the content or manner of what is going on is too controlled or constricting, or indicates a desire for a switch from work to play, from reasoning to acting out, or from self-control to expression (Bales & Cohen, 1979, pp. 355-386).

SYMLOG would appear to be a feasible measurement of communication competence. Bales and Cohen (1979) make it clear that the SYMLOG tools measure traits or the attribution of personality characteristics to the actor. These attributions are signaled by both the actor's verbal and nonverbal behavior. Measurements of these attributions can be made by others participating in the interaction or by the actor. Rather than describing these traits as anything very lasting in the personality, Bales and Cohen suspect that the trait descriptions provided by SYMLOG are indications of the memories one has about other people built from

what that person has said or done in the interaction. In this analysis, the trait is influenced by the situational elements and represents a general abstraction or conceptualization of the other actors in a group (Bales & Cohen, 1979).

> The actor cannot help 'building a reputation' of some kind in the group, and others cannot help their tendencies to encapsulate their expectations in the words, gestures, and basic evaluative concepts that they have learned as a part of their language and culture (Bales & Cohen, 1979, p. 214).

Building on the relational model of communication competence, then, it would appear that SYMLOG would be an appropriate measuring tool for further validating the Spitzberg and Cupach models of communication competence. Besides validating the association of behavior to appropriateness and effectiveness, the SYMLOG dimensions can provide a pattern of the social interaction that takes place in the group.

> Relational competence represents a context-specific, interpersonal conversational construct. It assesses each actor's self-perceptions, and allows each to be a participant-observer of the other person's communicative skill as well (Spitzberg & Canary, in press, p. 7).

This is precisely the function afforded by the SYMLOG methodology. Each group member evaluates themselves and the other group members as a result of a specific interaction.

In the prior competence research, some assumptions have been made with respect to the type of personality behavior displayed if an actor was judged as appropriate or effective. Canary and Spitzberg (1985) report that in most social situations appropriate responses are more likely to be positively

reinforced. If an actor receives positive feedback for interaction, s/he is likely to fulfill the self-fulfilling prophecy cycle and respond favorably. Thus, the actor who is perceived as interacting appropriately is also likely to be perceived as positive on the SYMLOG dimensions. Conversely, Canary and Spitzberg (1985) report Bellack and Hersen's view that communication is inappropriate if negative social sanctions are applied. This would indicate that the person who is perceived as interacting inappropriately would likely be judged as behaving negatively on the SYMLOG dimensions.

Canary and Spitzberg (1985) report that research on assertiveness indicates the importance of accomplishing individual goals through communication. Effectiveness is judged differently for self than for other actors in the interaction. "People judge themselves as more competent to the extent that self-goals are accomplished. In contrast, people judge conversational partners as more competent to the extent that they are appropriate in the conversation" (Canary & Spitzberg, 1985, p. 6). This interpretation would lead one to expect actors who perceive themselves as effective to also perceive themselves as task oriented (the F dimension). This would explain the concern for personal goal achievement as a factor of effectiveness.

Canary and Spitzberg (1985) summarize the behaviors usually attributed to the two dimensions of communication competence with appropriateness being more closely aligned with social attractiveness while effectiveness is more similar to task attractiveness. Thus, the following hypotheses are introduced:

H5: People who are perceived by others as interacting appropriately in the interaction will be perceived as positive (P) on the SYMLOG dimensions.

H6: People who perceive themselves as effective in the interaction will perceive themselves as task oriented (F) on the SYMLOG dimensions.

Although the appropriateness and effectiveness measures constitute competence in communication, an additional and separate measure of communication competence is provided (Cupach & Spitzberg, 1981; Canary & Spitzberg, 1985). The earlier competence studies introduced the hypothesis that both appropriateness and effectiveness would be strongly related to the measure of competence. To further validate this, Canary and Spitzberg (1985) propose that interpersonal attraction can be viewed as a perceptual outcome of communication processes, and that competent communication is more likely to produce perceptions of attractiveness than incompetent communication. Thus, the following hypothesis is provided:

H7: Persons who are perceived as competent by other group members will be perceived as exhibiting positive (P) behavior according to the SYMLOG dimensions.

Methodology

Students enrolled in a basic communication course at a large midwestern university self-selected themselves into task oriented work groups as part of a course assignment. Thus, there was no control, other than the controls each group placed on themselves,

for sex, age, or any other individual variable criteria within the group selection process. Each group had to complete a task that was: 1) goal oriented, 2) to be completed by an assigned date, and 3) to be graded by the course instructor. These characteristics aid in rendering the groups as similar to other task oriented groups that might be found in actual work or social organizations.

As a result of the self-selection process, there were five groups. Four groups were composed of five people each; one group had four group members. The sample for the study was 24. Group members were told they would receive course credit for participating in a research study. Extra credit was awarded on the completion and return of the questionnaires. Subjects were not told the nature of the study. No student refused participation in the study; thus, all group members are fully represented in the self and other perceptual measurements.

Each subject was given a packet of questionnaires containing the following questionnaires: self-competence, alter competence, effectiveness of the interaction as measured by the subject, and appropriateness of the other group members' interaction, all which were adapted from the Spitzberg and Cupach model. Additionally, self-satisfaction with the group interaction (Wall & Nolan, in press), self-reported Interaction Involvement (Cegala, 1984), and SYMLOG Adjective Rating Form (Bales & Cohen, 1979) ratings of self and other group members completed the questionnaire packet. A complete questionnaire packet is included as Appendix A (see page 24).

With the exception of the SYMLOG rating instrument, subjects responded to each questionnaire on a Likert type scale with a 1 to 7 response set (very strongly agree to very strongly disagree). The SYMLOG response set consisted of a range from 0 to 2 (never to always). The subjects were instructed to fill out the questionnaires on the basis of their interaction in the work group. The groups had been working together for about seven weeks prior to filling out the questionnaires, but had not yet completed the group assignment.

Scores were found by totaling responses to each item of the respective questionnaire. Since correlation was the intended method of analysis no further manipulation of scores was conducted. When it was necessary to determine a group average perception (i.e., the alter-competence of Subject X by the group), the scores given by other group members to the target group member were averaged by simple arithmetic mean.

Internal Reliabilities

Internal consistency reliabilites were determined using Cronbach's alpha. The self-assessment instruments reported the following internal reliability coefficients: self-competence questionnaire, .87; Interaction Involvement instrument, .86; communication effectiveness questionnaire, .94; and satisfaction instrument, .93. In each case, these internal reliabilities meet or exceed previously reported figures for internal reliabilities. The questionnaires that provided group perception measures of a target individual resulted in the following internal reliability coefficients: communication appropriateness, .89; communication

competence, .95; SYMLOG dominance-submissiveness, .79; SYMLOG positive-negative, .32; and SYMLOG instrumentally controlled-emotionally expressive, .71.

The moderately strong to very strong internal reliabilities for those measures of group perceptions, with the exception of the positive-negative dimension of the SYMLOG instrument, indicate that the group members had very consistent perceptions of the target individual. These high reliabilities offer support for the arithematic averaging technique used in computing correlations among the variables.

Results

The first hypothesis intended to validate the Spitzberg and Cupach competence model by testing the correlation of self-judged conversation effectiveness to the averaged perception of other group members of the target individual's behavior appropriateness. The Pearson Product correlation computed to test this hypothesis was not significant ($r = .29$, $p = .08$). Rather self-assessment of conversation effectiveness was highly correlated to one's assessment of his/her competence in the interaction ($r = .69$, $p < .001$), and strongly correlated to one's assessment of satisfaction with the interaction ($p = .62$, $p = .001$). From the perspective of the other group members, the averaged group perception of competence was also correlated to the target individual's conversation effectiveness ($r = .60$, $p = .001$).

The second hypothesis was to test the correlation between one's satisfaction with the group interaction and the individual's assessment of his/her own competence. The correlation was significant ($r = .74$, $p < .001$). Satisfaction was also positively correlated to self-perception of conversation effectiveness ($r = .62$, $p = .001$) as reported previously in Hypothesis 1 and to the averaged competence perception by other group members ($r = .55$, $p = .002$).

According to the third hypothesis, the highly involved individual would be perceived by other group members as interacting appropriately within the group setting. Support for this hypothesis was not found ($r = .17$, $p = .212$). However, highly involved individuals did perceive themselves as being more competent ($r = .80$, $p < .001$). A post hoc analysis using the three factors of Interaction Involvement--receptiveness, perceptiveness, and attentiveness-- did not yield any significant correlations.

The fourth hypothesis suggested that involved individuals would consider themselves more effective in the conversation was moderately supported ($r = .57$, $p = .002$).

The remaining hypotheses are concerned with the relationships between competence measures and the SYMLOG dimensions. Specifically, the fifth hypothesis suggested that the people who were perceived by other group members as behaving appropriately in the interaction would be judged as exhibiting positive behavior according to the SYMLOG behavior dimensions. The correlation for this hypothesis was significant ($r = .67$, $p < .001$). The sixth hypothesis looked at a relationship on

another SYMLOG dimension. Here, it was suggested that group members who perceived themselves as being effective in the interaction would perceive themselves as task oriented (F) on the SYMLOG behavioral dimensions. The correlation for this hypothesis was not significant ($r = .32$, $p = .061$). The last hypothesis tested the relationship between competence and the positive-negative SYMLOG dimension from the perspective of the other group members. Group members who were percevied to be competent by other group members were expected to be perceived exhibiting positive behaviors. This correlation was significant ($r = .69$, $p < .001$). Although not specified in a hypothesis, a significant correlation also was found between the self-assessment of the dominant SYMLOG dimension and the self-report of competence.

Discussion

In total, this study did not completely validate the Spitzberg and Cupach communication competence model. Primarily, this study did not support Spitzberg and Cupach's major theoretical anchor of the communication competence model that self-assessment of conversational effectiveness would be related to the interaction partners' assessment of the target's behavior appropriateness.

The self-assessments of competence from the Spitzberg and Cupach model are significantly correlated to other variations of competence assessments. The results of Hypotheses 2 and 4 provide support here. In each instance, a measure of self-competence was positively and significantly correlated to

another dimension of self-competence. In Hypothesis 2, self-competence was supported by the self-assessment of satisfaction with the group interaction; in Hypothesis 4, self-assessment of conversation effectiveness was supported by self-assessment of the amount of involvement in the interaction.

Relationships between the SYMLOG dimensions and the model's measures were mixed. The relationship between the positive SYMLOG dimension and group assessment of target individual's appropriateness was significant. Also significant was the relationship between this same SYMLOG dimension and the group assessment of the target's competence. However, these significant relationships must be called into question since reliability among the group members' perceptions on the positive SYMLOG dimension were not of an acceptable level. Not significant was the expected relationship between the task oriented SYMLOG dimension and self-reports of communication effectiveness.

Several reasons can be suggested for the mixed results of this study. First, perhaps the model cannot be appropriately extrapolated from the dyadic mode to the small group mode. Although one would expect that the model' underlying theoretical arguments would be appropriate for small group analysis, these measuring instruments may not provide the venicle for reliable assessment. This first reason dovetails with the second. Currently there are no statistical methods for testing the concept of group perceptions. In the dyadic model it is easy to correlate reciprocal perceptions. However, in the small group format these types of correlations become unyieldingly complicated as each person is assessed by every other person in the

group. As in the case of this study, it was necessary to average the individual perceptions from group members to define an averaged group perception even though in reality no such perception exists. Other statistical methods do exist for finding averages (rather than the simple arithmetic mean). However, the point remains, some type of averaging among group members must be done even though it is clear that each member forms an individual perception of every other group member. The high internal reliabilities among group members' perceptions of the target individual do lend support for using this type of statistical technique. Although these figures aid in supporting statistical assumptions, it still does not answer the critical question of finding an acceptable substitute for group perceptions.

Although this study was not completely successful, some interesting relationships were exposed. The results for Hypothesis 1 were not supported and, perhaps, this **does** provide validation for the competence model. The model postulates that individuals assess their own competence on a much more specific and molecular basis while assessing the competence of others on a generalized or molar basis. Initially, it would appear that as self-assessment of one's effectiveness rises, the other group members would also perceive an increase in the target individual's appropriateness. However, since appropriateness and effectiveness individually are significantly correlated to other expected measures of competence, this may support the model's separation of the self and other assessment instruments further indicating that separation was necessary and valid.

Appropriate behavior as judged by other group members was expected to be correlated to the level of interaction involvement as assessed by the target individual. However, no significance was found. Perhaps Hypothesis 3 was confounded by using an averaged group perception in relation to a self-assessment measure, for the literature supporting interaction involvement and appropriate behavior certainly suggests a closer relationship. Examination of the individual items that comprise the appropriateness instrument indicate that an individual would have to be quite out of line to receive a low rating in appropriateness. Nearly two-thirds of the items are directed toward discovering inappropriate conversational interaction. However, the nature in which these items are stated (e.g., "Some of the things s/he said were awkward," and "S/he said some things that should not have been said.") would necessitate very inappropriate behavior for the target individual to be rated at the most negative point of the Likert scale.

When one averaged group perception was tested against another, significant results were found. Hypothesis 5 suggested that group members would perceive the target individual's appropriate behavior similarly to their perception of the target individual's positive (friendly) behavior. This hypothesis was supported. Also, in Hypothesis 7, the averaged group perception of positive behavior was similarly perceived to the group's averaged perception of the target individual's competence.

Hypothesis 6 suggested that task oriented behavior as assessed by the individual would be correlated to self-assessment of conversation effectiveness. This hypothesis was not supported.

Further research is needed here as the literature suggests that conversation effectiveness is manifested by being task oriented in an attempt to control the conversation for personal goals and purposes. Not only would conversation effectiveness be expected to correlate to the SYMLOG task oriented dimension, one could expect conversation effectiveness to be correlated to satisfaction with the group's interaction. In this instance, neither case was supported.

The choice of methodological instruments for this study meet the seven criteria established by Spitzberg and Cupach. So it is disappointing that this study provided only some validation for the adaptation of the Spitzberg and Cupach dyadic communication competence model to the small group format. However, methodological confoundment may have superseded the intended goals.

References

Bales, R. F., & Cohen, S. P. (1979). SYMLOG: A system for the multiple level observation of groups. New York: Free Press.

Canary, D. J., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1985). Appropriateness and effectiveness in the perception of conflict strategies. Paper presented at the convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver.

Cegala, D. J. (1984). Affective and cognitive manifestations of interaction involvement during unstructured and competitive interactions. Communication Monographs, 51, 320-328.

Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1981). Relational competence: Measurement and validation. Paper presented at the meeting of the Behavioral Science Interest Group, Western Speech Communication Association, San Jose, CA.

Hecht, M. L. (1978). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 4, 253-264.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Canary, D. J. (in press). Loneliness and relational competence. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1984). Interpersonal communication competence. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Wall, V. D., & L. L. Nolan. (in press). Small group conflict: A look at equity, satisfaction and styles of conflict management. Small Group Behavior.

APPENDIX A

SELF-RATED COMPETENCE

Thinking of your interaction while working in your workshop group, please respond to the following questions concerning your behavior.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = moderately disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = undecided
5 = slightly agree
6 = moderately agree
7 = strongly agree

1. I was relaxed and comfortable while speaking.
2. I was a likable person.
3. I expressed myself clearly.
4. I gave positive feedback.
5. I was trustworthy.
6. I was assertive.
7. I was a good listener.
8. I was supportive.
9. I showed an interest in the conversation.
10. I was sarcastic.
11. I was awkward in the conversation.
12. I was socially skilled.
13. I was confident.
14. I found it difficult to express my true feelings.
15. I ignored the other group members' feelings.
16. I lacked self-confidence.
17. I was an effective conversationalist.
18. I talked too much about myself.
19. I pretended to listen when I actually didn't.
20. I was shy.
21. I was nervous during the conversation.
22. My facial expressions were abnormally blank and restrained.
23. I was a competent communicator.
24. I was respectful.
25. I interrupted too much.
26. I understood the other people.
27. I was sensitive to the needs and feelings of the others.
28. I was cooperative.

INTERACTION INVOLVEMENT

Thinking of your behavior and interaction while working in workshop group, please answer the following questions describing your own behavior.

1 = not like me at all
2 = not like me
3 = somewhat unlike me
4 = not sure
5 = somewhat like me
6 = like me
7 = very much like me

29. I am keenly aware of how others perceive me during my conversations with workshop group members.

30. My mind wanders during workshop group converstions and I often miss parts of what is going on.

31. Often in workshop group conversations I'm not sure what to say, I can't seem to find the appropriate lines.

32. I carefully observe how others respond to me during workshop group conversations.

33. During workshop group conversations I often will pretend to be listening to someone when in fact I'm thinking about something else.

34. Often in workshop group conversations, I'm not sure what my role is; that is, I'm not sure how I'm expected to relate to others.

35. I listen carefully to others during workshop group conversations.

36. During workshop group conversations, I am often preoccupied and do not pay complete attention to the others.

37. Often in workshop group conversations I'm not sure what others are reallly saying.

38. Often in workshop group conversations I am not sure what others' needs (e.g., reassurance, a compliment, etc.) are until it is too late to respond appropriately.

39. During workshop group conversations I am sensitive to others' subtle or hidden meanings.

40. I am very observant of others during workshop group conversations.

41. In workshop group conversations I pay close attention to what others say and do and try to obtain as much information as I can get.

42. During workshop group conversations I often feel sort of "unplugged" from the social situation of which I am part; that is, I'm uncertain of my role, others' motives, and what's happening.

43. In conversations with my workshop I really know what's going on; that is, I have a "handle on the situation."

44. In my workshop group conversations I can accurately perceive others' intentions quite well.

45. Often in workshop group conversations I'm not sure how I'm expected to respond.

46. In workshop group conversations I am responsive to the meaning of others' behavior in relation to myself and the situation.

GROUP SATISFACTION

Please answer the following questions in relation to how you felt during your workshop group meetings.

1 = very strongly agree
2 = strongly agree
3 = agree
4 = neither agree or disagree
5 = disagree
6 = strongly disagree
7 = very strongly disagree

47. I felt my ideas were stifled by my group.

48. My enthusiasm to work with the group was low.

49. I only stayed with my group because I had to do so.

50. I came away from most of my group meetings feeling resentful toward the group.

51. I would describe my amount of frustration, due to the behavior of other group members, as "very high."

52. Overall, I am satisfied with my group's performance for the project.

53. I am satisfied with the quality of my group's work.

54. I came away from most of my group's meetings feeling good about our work.

55. Overall, I would describe my interactions with other group members as "very satisfying."

56. I am "very frustrated" with the quality of my group's work.

CONVERSATION EFFECTIVENESS

Now thinking of the conversations themselves, answer the following statements to describe your feelings.

1 = very strongly disagree
2 = strongly disagree
3 = mildly disagree
4 = undecided
5 = mildly agree
6 = strongly agree
7 = very strongly agree

57. Our conversations were very beneficial.
58. The other people were more active in the conversations than I was.
59. I achieved everything I hoped to achieve in our conversations.
60. These were useless conversations.
61. I was in control of the conversations.
62. I was effective in the conversations.
63. Our conversations were unsuccessful.
64. I just let the other people talk most of the time.
65. I got what I wanted our of the conversations.
66. The conversations were unprofitable.
67. These were advantageous conversations.
68. I was an ineffective conversationalist.
69. I didn't know what was going on in the conversations.
70. These were rewarding conversations.
71. The other people dominated the conversations.
72. I talked most of the time.
73. I found the conversations to be very useful and helpful.
74. The other people controlled the conversations.
75. The conversations went pretty much the way I wanted.
76. The conversations were very unrewarding.

OTHER APPROPRIATENESS

Again thinking of the conversations themselves, answer the following questions to describe your feelings about the behavior of the other group members. Do not rate yourself.

1 = very strongly disagree
2 = strongly disagree
3 = mildly disagree
4 = undecided agree
5 = mildly agree
6 = strongly agree
7 = very strongly agree

77. S/he said several things that seemed out of place in our conversation.
78. S/he was a smooth conversationalist.
79. Everything the s/he said was appropriate.
80. Occasionally, s/he made statements that made me feel uncomfortable.
81. Her/his conversation was very suitable to the situation.
82. Some the things s/he said were awkward.
83. Her/his communication was very proper.
84. S/he said some things that should not have been said.
85. I was embarrassed at times by his/her remarks.
86. Some of her/his remarks were inappropriate.
87. I was comfortable throughout the conversation with his/her remarks.
88. Some of things s/he said were in bad taste.
89. None of her/his remarks were embarrassing to me.
90. S/he said some things that were simply the incorrect things to say.
91. S/he did not violate any of my expectations in the conversation.
92. The way s/he said some of his/her remarks was unsuitable.
93. The things s/he spoke about were all in good taste as far as I'm concerned.
94. Some of his/her remarks were simply improper.
95. S/he interrupted me in the conversation.
96. At least one of her/his remarks was rude.

ALTER COMPETENCE

Now, thinking about the other people in the conversations, rate each person on each of the following descriptions. Do not rate yourself.

1 = very strongly disagree
2 = strongly disagree
3 = mildly disagree
4 = undecided
5 = mildly agree
6 = strongly agree
7 = very strongly disagree

97. S/he was versatile.
98. S/he was sympathetic.
99. S/he was likable.
100. S/he gave positive feedback.
101. S/he was trustworthy.
102. S/he was assertive.
103. S/he was a good listener.
104. S/he was supportive.
105. S/he appeared tired and sleepy.
106. S/he was awkward in the conversations.
107. S/he spoke too rapidly.
108. S/he was confident.
109. S/he ignored my feelings.
110. S/he lacked self-confidence.
111. S/he spoke too slowly.
112. S/he could easily put her/himself in another person's shoes.
113. Her/his voice was monotone and boring.
114. Her/his facial expressions were abnormally blank and restrained.
115. S/he was adaptable.
116. S/he had an accurate self-perception.
117. S/he was easy to confide in.
118. S/he was respectful.
119. S/he understood me.
120. S/he paid attention to the conversations.
121. S/he was sensitive to my needs and feelings in the conversation.
122. S/he was polite.
123. S/he was cooperative.